

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 155--81st Congress

Chapter 292--1st Session

H. R. 5240

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 155	1
Index and Summary of History of H. R. 5240	7

FATS, OILS, RICE IMPORT CONTROLS. Amends the Second War Powers Act, 1942, so as to continue until July 1, 1950, the authority for exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products, upon determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation or temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON H. R. 5240.

June 15, 1949	H. R. 5165 was introduced by Rep. Cooley and was referred to the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Print of the bill as introduced. (Similar bill).
June 20, 1949	H. R. 5240 was introduced by Rep. Spence and was referred to the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Print of the bill as introduced.
June 21, 1949	House Committee reported H. R. 5240 with amendment. House Report 868. Print of the bill as reported. Hearings: House, H. R. 5240.
June 23, 1949	S. 2132 was introduced by Senator Gillette and was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Print of the bill as introduced. (Companion bill). House discussed and passed H. R. 5240 with amendments.
June 24, 1949	Print of H. R. 5240 as referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.
June 27, 1949	Senate Committee reported H. R. 5240 without amendment. Senate Report 593. Print of the bill as reported.
June 29, 1949	Senate discussed and passed over H. R. 5240.
June 30, 1949	Senate discussed and passed H. R. 5240 without amendment.
July 1, 1949	Approved. Public Law 155.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5165

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 15, 1949

Mr. COOLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

A BILL

To continue in effect until January 1, 1951, title III of the Second War Powers Act for the purpose of exercising import controls with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, subsection (b) of section 1501 of the Second War
4 Powers Act, 1942, as amended, is hereby further amended
5 to read as follows:

6 “(b) Title III of the Act and the amendments to
7 existing law made by such title shall remain in force until
8 January 1, 1951, for the purpose of exercising, adminis-
9 tering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats

1 and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter,
2 soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petro-
3 leum products) and rice and rice products: *Provided, how-*
4 *ever,* That (1) import controls over these commodities shall
5 not be used except where (a) essential to the acquisition
6 or distribution of products in world short supply or (b)
7 essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses
8 of stocks owned or controlled by the Government or of
9 industries developed in the territory of the United States
10 owing to the exigencies of war which it would be uneconomic
11 to maintain in normal conditions, and (2) that such controls
12 shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to
13 them have ceased.”

14 SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect on July 1, 1949.

H. R. 5165

A BILL

To continue in effect until January 1, 1951, title III of the Second War Powers Act for the purpose of exercising import controls with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products.

By Mr. COOLEY

JUNE 15, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5240

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 20, 1949

Mr. SPENCE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

A BILL

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III
4 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the
5 amendments to existing law made by such title shall con-
6 tinue in effect until January 1, 1951, for the purpose of
7 authorizing the exercising, administering, and enforcing of
8 import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-
9 bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder,
10 but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice

1 and rice products, upon a determination by the President
 2 that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or
 3 distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essen-
 4 tial to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks
 5 owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,*
 6 That such controls shall be removed as soon as the condi-
 7 tions giving rise to them have ceased.

81ST CONGRESS
 1ST SESSION

H. R. 5240

A BILL

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

By Mr. SPENCE

JUNE 20, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

IMPORTS CONTROLS ON FATS, OILS, RICE, AND RICE PRODUCTS

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. R. 5240

A BILL TO CONTINUE FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD
CERTAIN POWERS, AUTHORITY, AND DISCRETION
FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXERCISING, ADMINISTER-
ING, AND ENFORCING IMPORT CONTROLS WITH
RESPECT TO FATS AND OILS, AND RICE AND RICE
PRODUCTS

JUNE 21, 1949

Printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1951

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

BRENT SPENCE, Kentucky. *Chairman*

PAUL BROWN, Georgia

WRIGHT PATMAN, Texas

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma

BROOKS HAYS, Arkansas

ALBERT RAINS, Alabama

FRANK BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania

ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York

CHARLES B. DEANE, North Carolina

GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, Michigan

CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Connecticut

CLINTON D. MCKINNON, California

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey

ISIDORE DOLLINGER, New York

HUGH B. MITCHELL, Washington

BARRATT O'HARA, Illinois

JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan

RALPH A. GAMBLE, New York

FREDERICK C. SMITH, Ohio

JOHN C. KUNKEL, Pennsylvania

HENRY O. TALLE, Iowa

ROLLA C. McMILLEN, Illinois

CLARENCE E. KILBURN, New York

ALBERT M. COLE, Kansas

MERLIN HULL, Wisconsin

HARDIE SCOTT, Pennsylvania

DONALD W. NICHOLSON, Massachusetts

WILLIAM J. HALLAHAN, *Clerk*

ORMAN S. FINK, *Professional Staff*

JOHN E. BARRIERE, *Professional Staff*

CONTENTS

	Page
H. R. 5240. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products-----	1
Statement of—	
Trigg, Ralph S., Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture-----	1

IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS, OILS, RICE, AND RICE PRODUCTS

TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 1949

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. Brent Spence (chairman) presiding.

Present: Mr. Spence, Mr. Brown, Mr. Patman, Mr. Hays, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Multer, Mr. Deane, Mr. O'Brien, Mrs. Woodhouse, Mr. Addonizio, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. Smith, Mr. Talle, Mr. Kilburn, Mr. Cole, Mr. Hull, and Mr. Nicholson.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

We have for consideration this morning H. R. 5240.

(The bill referred to is as follows:)

[H. R. 5240, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by such title shall continue in effect until January 1, 1951, for the purpose of authorizing the exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,* That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.*

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Trigg, the head of the Production and Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture, is here to testify.

Mr. Trigg, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF RALPH S. TRIGG, ADMINISTRATOR, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. TRIGG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you in behalf of H. R. 5240. Let me say that the Secretary would have been here—Secretary Brannan—had it not been that other business was a bit pressing, and he could not get away this morning.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have a prepared statement in connection with this testimony this morning and would like to say that the

Department of Agriculture supports H. R. 5240 and would like to see its passage and adoption in order that we would be in a position to protect some of the commodities that we now have in inventory and some of the commodities that will be covered by this bill that we possibly would take into inventory as a result of price-support operations.

The principal commodity that is troubling us at the present time and to which this bill would apply is flaxseed. We have in storage at the present time some 20,000,000 bushels of flaxseed at a price of \$6 support, and some 25 cents additional for handling charges, storage, and so forth, or we might say a cost to Commodity Credit of about \$6.25 as it stands.

We have in addition thereto 345,000,000 pounds of linseed oil that has been processed from flaxseed that has been taken, and that in terms of bushels amounts to approximately 17,000,000 bushels of flaxseed. The price of the oil as it stands Commodity Credit is approximately 26 or 27 cents a pound. It has been reported to the Department that the price of oil, linseed oil, in other countries is as low as 9 cents a pound; also, that flaxseed is selling as low as \$3.80 to \$4 per bushel in other parts of the world.

It is with that thought in mind that we do feel the necessity for continuing import controls on the oil crops in order that we will be able to protect our own domestic production, and more particularly the inventories that have been taken over by the Government thus far. *Trigg* "Flax is the principal crop that the controls, as the bill is drawn, would apply to. It does apply to other oil seeds such as cottonseed, soya bean, peanuts, and other things which are just as essential because of the fact there could come a situation in the world which would hamper our operations here and cost us a terrific amount of money."

Mr. BROWN. "Would you mind enumerating the oil crops you could control?"

Mr. TRIGG. "The crops we would consider would be soya beans, cottonseed, flaxseed, lard, and that sort of thing. I might have missed one or two."

Mr. KILBURN. "How about butter?"

Mr. TRIGG. "Peanuts and butter."

Mr. BROWN. "I think that list will be very helpful because that question will be asked on the floor. You should enumerate the crops that would be under your jurisdiction under this bill."

The CHAIRMAN. "This bill would just extend the authority you now have under existing law?"

Mr. TRIGG. "That is correct, sir."

The CHAIRMAN. "Which will expire on the 30th day of this month unless extended."

Mr. TRIGG. "That is correct. The authority as presently written does expire on June 30."

Mr. KILBURN. "What is the harm in putting butter in the bill?"

Mr. TRIGG. "There is no harm in putting it in. Butter is included in the bill. The bill says:

* * * fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) * * *

Mr. KILBURN. "So butter is in the bill."

Mr. TRIGG. "It is, sir; yes."

The CHAIRMAN. And you feel that the enactment of this act is very essential to the national economy?

Mr. TRIGG. I feel, Mr. Chairman, it is essential at this time until we are a little farther down the road and are able to tell what our production will be on some of these crops, and also what we will be obligated to take under Commodity Credit Corporation price-support operations, and at that time it is the Department's intention, if it is given any authority, or if the controls are extended, to remove any controls over any of these commodities at the earliest possible time when it is in the interest of the economy of the country.

But we do have these crops that are coming in this bill here that we have price-support operations on, and we will be responsible for supporting those, to the producer, and if other countries are shipping into this country the same crop we have here, all it means is that we are actually supporting the same crop on a world basis; that we are extending price support to other countries.

It is with that thought in mind—and particularly since we have a huge inventory of one of these crops—that we do need the authority.

Mr. BROWN. You stand to lose how much money if this bill does not pass, on the surplus commodities that you now have?

Mr. TRIGG. We have now about \$225,000,000 in flaxseed alone. That is the seed and the oil that I spoke of. That represents \$6.25 a bushel for the seed and 27 cents for the oil. It could be that we would have to dispose of the oil at a world competitive price. If oil could be laid down in New York at 10 or 11 cents a pound, we might take as much as 17 or 18 cents a pound loss on oil alone to the extent of 345,000,000 pounds. I do not know what that loss would be. We would probably have to assume a loss of \$2 on all the flaxseed, because the price of flaxseed in the country to the north of us is \$3.80 to \$4 a bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is flax raised outside the United States?

Mr. TRIGG. Principally the competing countries are Canada and the Argentine.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there large crops this year?

Mr. TRIGG. The indications are that the crops are large; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It would mean that you would have to support the price of that flax when you supported the price of the American flax; is that not true?

Mr. TRIGG. That is correct. In addition to their crops coming on, it is reported to us that there is an 11,000,000-bushel surplus from last year's crop in Canada alone. That presents an additional problem.

Mr. TALLE. As I understand it, Mr. Trigg, the Department is asking for authority relating only to import controls.

Mr. TRIGG. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TALLE. And the classifications enumerated here are fats and oils as one, and rice and rice products as a second one.

Mr. KILBURN. Butter is in there.

Mr. TALLE. Would you have any objection to an amendment which would make the enacting clause read as follows:

Fats and oils, butter, and rice and rice products?

Mr. BROWN. That is already in there under fats and oils.

Mr. TALLE. I realize it is down below in parentheses. It is enumerated there; nevertheless, I should like to have it up above inas-

much as fats and oils more often relate to lard and other oils, and in the minds of a good many people it does not include butter. There would be no harm, would there, in putting the word "butter" in there inasmuch as it is in the body of the bill down below?

Mr. TRIGG. Mr. Talle, if it is the wish of the committee to put it in there, I see no harm that would come from it because our interpretation is that fats and oils include butter.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the interpretation of the Department?

Mr. TRIGG. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That fats and oils include butter?

Mr. TRIGG. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN. It is in here; it is in the bill. I would have no objection to it, but I do not see the reason why you should do it.

Mr. KILBURN. It is not at the top of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. You want it in the title, Mr. Talle?

Mr. TALLE. I would like to have it follow, "fats and oils, butter, and rice and rice products."

Mr. PATMAN. Why not put "including butter"? I do not see any reason why it should be in there, but if you put it in there without saying "including butter" you indicate that it does not include butter.

Mr. TALLE. I will agree to that. Would that be satisfactory to the Department?

Mr. TRIGG. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. TALLE. Have it read, "fats and oils", and then "(including butter)."

Mr. TRIGG. Yes.

Mr. TALLE. May I take the figures that you gave at the outset as I may be sure that my information is correct? I think you said that the Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand now an inventory of 20,000,000 bushels of flaxseed.

Mr. TRIGG. Yes.

Mr. TALLE. And the price is \$6.

Mr. TRIGG. \$6.25, including handling charges.

Mr. TALLE. The 25 cents represents handling charges?

Mr. TRIGG. \$6 to the producer, and 25 cents represents storage and handling charges which we have taken into inventory.

Mr. TALLE. That is right.

May I clarify what you said following that? You mentioned oil at 27 cents a pound. Will you restate that?

Mr. TRIGG. We have in addition to the 20,000,000 bushels of flaxseed as seed, 345,000,000 pounds of linseed oil, which, of course, is the product of flaxseed. Expressing that in terms of bushels, that amounts to about 17,000,000 bushels of flaxseed.

Mr. TALLE. I think that you said the price at which foreign countries will offer this oil may be \$3.80 to \$4.

Mr. TRIGG. That is for the seed per bushel.

Mr. TALLE. So the seed might come in at a price of \$3.80 to \$4 to compete with the \$6.25 commodity that you have on hand.

Mr. TRIGG. That is right.

Mr. TALLE. From what countries, principally, does the flax come that is in competition with our product?

Mr. TRIGG. From Canada and the Argentine.

Mr. HULL. What percent comes from the Argentine that is used in this country—about 60 percent?

Mr. TRIGG. None of it now.

Mr. HULL. There has been some in the past?

Mr. TRIGG. In the past there has been some coming in. I do not have the percentage of that; but about 50 percent prewar.

Mr. TALLE. I certainly believe in letting the American farmer have the American market, the choicest of all markets. I certainly will not interpose any objection, if I understand this legislation to be what I think it is.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will this interfere in any way with the reciprocal trade agreements?

Mr. TRIGG. I do not believe so; no, sir. It has not in the past.

Mr. NICHOLSON. You are going to control imports under this bill.

Mr. TRIGG. On these particular commodities; yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How are you going to control them—stop them from coming in?

Mr. TRIGG. They have not been coming in in the past, sir, and this is a continuation of the present legislation that is now in effect.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I understood that we could buy this seed by the bushel at \$4 or less, and it costs us now \$6.25 a bushel; is that right?

Mr. TRIGG. We have an inventory of 20,000,000 bushels of it, which stands the Government \$6.25 per bushel because of the price-support operations on this particular commodity. If the Government continues import control, the other seeds in other countries that might come in at \$3.80 to \$4 a bushel will not be permitted to come in as long as we have a sufficient supply of it on hand here, which we do have at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions?

(No response.)

We thank your for your statement.

This bill as drawn is satisfactory to the Department?

Mr. TRIGG. Yes; it is.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no objection to the amendment suggested by Dr. Talle—“(including butter)”?

Mr. TRIGG. As I understand it, it will be left in down below as it is—(including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products).

You just wanted butter up in the title?

Mr. TALLE. Tes.

Mr. TRIGG. That is perfectly agreeable to us.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to reporting the bill with the amendment suggested by Dr. Talle?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I think that we ought to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want a roll call?

Mr. NICHOLSON. If we have an executive session, we ought to wait until the people go out of the room, to take a vote.

Mr. KILBURN. I agree with Mr. Nicholson.

Mr. DEANE. He is right.

Mr. HAYS. Let us have an executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. We will now go into executive session.

(Whereupon, at 11 a. m., the committee went into executive session.)

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF IMPORT CONTROL AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO FATS AND OILS (INCLUDING BUTTER) AND RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS

JUNE 21, 1949. Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

MR. SPENCE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5240]

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5240) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Recently the committee reported and the House passed H. R. 5044 which provided for extension until June 30, 1950, of the powers, authority, and discretion with respect to tin and tin products conferred upon the President under authority of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, as amended.

The Secretary of Agriculture has requested an extension of the import-control authority with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products until January 1, 1951. Such import controls have been exercised under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, as amended, and would otherwise expire on June 30 of this year.

In a letter to the chairman of the committee under date of June 20, 1949, the Secretary stated:

Rice is still in short world supply and is the only agricultural commodity that will remain under international allocation after June 30, 1949. We believe that it is highly desirable for the United States to continue to cooperate with other nations associated with the IEFC with respect to the one remaining commodity in world short supply. Import controls on rice and rice products are essential if this cooperation is continued.

With respect to fats and oils (other than petroleum and petroleum products) the Secretary of Agriculture in the letter above referred to stated:

This Department also believes that domestic surpluses of flaxseed (linseed oil) and edible oils necessitate the continuation of import controls. It is believed that the controls are essential not only to protect the farmers' marketing of the oilseed crops and peanuts, but also to facilitate orderly liquidation of the surpluses owned or controlled by the Government.

Current information indicates that the world supplies of flaxseed and linseed oil are probably the largest on record. The United States production last year was 52,533,000 bushels. The production in Argentina was 21,400,000 bushels and their carry-over of stocks at the beginning of this year amounted to 9,600,000 bushels of flaxseed and 224,000 metric tons of oil (equivalent to 27,000,000 bushels of seed). The old crop and new crop supplies provide a current exportable surplus of more than 300,000 tons of oil (equivalent to 36,000,000 bushels of seed). The price paid to the farmers in Argentina was \$2.26½ per bushel of flaxseed. Reports also indicate Canadian production as 17,353,600 bushels with average farm prices ranging from \$3.78 to \$3.81 per bushel. Approximately 11,000,000 bushels are available for export. In Uruguay the production was reported as exceeding 5,000,000 bushels and the price paid to the farmers for the seed delivered at Montevideo was \$3.42. Mexico and India produced large exportable surpluses.

Following the receipt of the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture the committee held a hearing on the subject bill at which Mr. Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, emphasized the desirability of enacting the proposed legislation prior to the present expiration date of June 30, 1949. Mr. Trigg pointed out that the Commodity Credit Corporation had in storage at the present time approximately 20,000,000 bushels of flaxseed acquired under the price-support program at the \$6 a bushel support price. In addition to the support price paid, there have accrued handling and storage charges amounting to approximately 25 cents per bushel. Further, the Commodity Credit Corporation holds about 345,000,000 pounds of linseed oil processed from flaxseed that had been taken which in terms of flaxseed amounts to approximately 17,000,000 bushels of flaxseed.

While the authority for import controls for fats and oils is requested primarily with reference to the situation pertaining with respect to surplus stocks of flaxseed and linseed oil held by the Government, it will be noted from the wording of the bill that the fats and oils covered by the authority include oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but exclude petroleum and petroleum products. The bill would provide that such import controls would be exercised only upon a determination by the President that they are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government. Attention is also called to a proviso in the bill which states "that such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased."

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5240

[Report No. 868]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 20, 1949

Mr. SPENCE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

JUNE 21, 1949

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Amend the title]

A BILL

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III
4 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the
5 amendments to existing law made by such title shall con-
6 tinue in effect until January 1, 1951, for the purpose of
7 authorizing the exercising, administering, and enforcing of
8 import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-
9 bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder,

1 but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice
2 and rice products, upon a determination by the President
3 that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or
4 distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essen-
5 tial to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks
6 owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,*
7 That such controls shall be removed as soon as the condi-
8 tions giving rise to them have ceased.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products."

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5240

[Report No. 868]

A BILL

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

By Mr. SPENCE

JUNE 20, 1949

Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

JUNE 21, 1949

Reported with an amendment, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2132

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 23 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Mr. GILLETTE introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

A BILL

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III
4 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the
5 amendments to existing law made by such title shall con-
6 tinue in effect until January 1, 1951, for the purpose of
7 authorizing the exercising, administering, and enforcing of
8 import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-
9 bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder,

1 but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice
2 and rice products, upon a determination by the President
3 that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or
4 distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essen-
5 tial to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks
6 owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,*
7 That such controls shall be removed as soon as the condi-
8 tions giving rise to them have ceased.

A BILL

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

By Mr. GILLETTE

JUNE 23 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Banking and Currency

no progress. The slum that had been there when I was born was still there. The only difference was that it was dingier, more dilapidated, more crowded. It was in every way worse than it had been in my childhood. I visited the third ward, also densely populated and another slum area of Newark, and found there conditions paralleling those in the first ward.

In both wards I talked with people who lived there. They talked about their kids and how they hoped that these growing children might live their lives in better surroundings than are afforded by the slums of Newark. I visited nearby cities. The story was the same.

My feeling about the need for this bill is not academic. I have been an active participant in the organization known as the Youth Movement for Rehabilitation of Delinquent Boys. I know the surroundings most delinquent boys come from. The evidence is overwhelming that the slums with their poverty, their dirt, and their ill health are breeding grounds for delinquency. If we wipe out the slums we will have taken a long step toward ending the conditions that foster juvenile delinquency. If we provide the opportunity for decent housing and wholesome play in proper neighborhoods, we can significantly reduce juvenile delinquency.

This is not just mere talk. A number of studies have been made comparing juvenile delinquency in slums and in public housing. One was made in Newark by a Newark University professor. He found that the delinquency rate was 21 percent lower in three public-housing developments as compared with three slum areas. Two of the slums he studied were these same two wards I recently visited.

He reported also that the public housing projects had 45 percent fewer cases of tuberculosis, 15 percent fewer infant deaths, 31 percent fewer cases of children's diseases, 37 percent more births, 74 percent fewer fires, and 100 percent fewer deaths from home accidents. Moreover, the effect of rehousing upon the children in their school life was remarkable. They showed a 7-percent improvement in attendance, 10-percent improvement in academic grades, 16-percent improvement in personality development grades, and 19-percent improvement in health habit grades. Can this be measured in dollars and cents?

Since my visit to Newark and adjoining cities, I have received letters from my constituents, including some from children, urging and pleading with me to support any legislation that will help them to better housing. I welcome their letters, but I do not need to be urged to support this bill. I know at first hand that it is a necessary measure. I am convinced that this Congress can make no greater contribution to the welfare of the Nation than to provide the tools that will enable American cities, large and small, to strike a death blow at the slums.

I am for the urban-redevelopment title of this measure because I know my own city must have help if it is to clear away the blight and rot that afflict it. Newark is not the only city that needs this help.

The mayors of other cities tell the same story. The problem we face is a national problem. It is a matter of saving our cities from decay.

I am for the public-housing title of the pending bill because we cannot afford to view this problem only in terms of the physical condition of the cities or as a tax problem or as a planning problem. It is all of these things, but it is also a problem of people. We will not be making progress if we clear the slums and forget to provide homes for the people who live in them. The simple truth is that many of the families who live in the slums cannot afford adequate housing. They are low-income families but they are not improvident nor destitute. They are self-respecting, competent members of our society. In other respects, they are providing for themselves and their children. But the cost of housing today puts good homes beyond their means. The public-housing title of this bill offers a tested and successful method of making good homes available to them.

When I have the opportunity, I will be proud to say that I voted for this bill and all it means to the families of America.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Boggs of Louisiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4009) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 4332) to make a change.

IMPORT CONTROLS ON CERTAIN COMMODITIES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5240) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the committee, explain the bill briefly, and also the amendment which I understand he intends to offer?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely continues the controls which now exist over the importation of fats and oils. The bill as originally drafted provided for an extension for a year and a half, but at the request of some of the Members we intend to offer an amendment which makes the extension for 1 year. The Department of Agriculture says it is very essential that these controls be continued. I can see no objection to the extension of the controls. There was no objection to the bill in committee and it was unanimously reported, as I recall.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress the fact that this legislation is a little bit difficult to understand. The people who voted for the reciprocal trade treaties a few weeks ago may find it is easier to pass this bill than to face the facts. In the first place, the President, under section 22 of the AAA Act has this authority. This bill is not necessary at all. I think it would be very appropriate to have a roll call on this bill to find out exactly who it was that supported the reciprocal trade treaties by so voting a few weeks ago. Then we could check up and see if they were for the treaties for everything but vegetable oils. So far as fats and vegetable oils are concerned, more of them were exported in 1948 than were imported. So it would be a good test, I am sure, to have a roll call to find out exactly where you stand on this import business.

I realize it is easy to vote this resolution without a roll call and still not be recorded against the trade treaties. I am for this resolution and voted against the New Deal brand of reciprocal trade treaties. Our vegetable oil friends are for free or freer trade except what is grown in the South.

In 1948 there were imports of \$104,596,000 worth of animal and vegetable oils and fats. There was exported \$104,000,000 worth of vegetable oil; \$420,000 worth of animal fats. Of the vegetable oil imports palm oil accounted for \$11,000,000; coconut oil, \$21,000,000, and tung oil, \$27,000,000. Butter imports were \$176,000 in value.

In 1948 there were exports totaling \$153,603,000 worth of animal and vegetable fats and oils. Of this amount exported there were \$20,300,000 worth of soy bean oil; \$3,700,000 cotton seed oil; \$9,000,000 linseed oil; oleo \$1,107,000. The animal fat and oil exports were \$87,803,000 in value, and \$70,000,000 worth of these exports was of lard.

The League of Women Voters might not be pleased to have the administration leaders use this indirect method of avoiding the effects of the reciprocal trade treaties.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the

Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by such title shall continue in effect until January 1, 1951, for the purpose of authorizing the exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however, That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.*

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: On page 1, line 6, strike out "January 1, 1951", where such appears therein, and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 892)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

* That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 26, 29, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 40.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 20, 27, and 28, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,975,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$16,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,725,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,367,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "996,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 25 and 39.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
PAT MCCARRAN,
HOMER FERGUSON,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3333) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon

and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$1,154,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,074,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$1,093,900 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,064,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$550,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$391,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$5,506,500 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Statistics, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6: Appropriate \$5,252,000 for salaries and expenses, Wage and Hour Division, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,361,000 as proposed by the House, and strike out, as proposed by the Senate, the language identifying the functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act relating to the recommended reduction below the amount in the House bill. The effect of this action and action recommended on amendment No. 3 is to transfer the youth employment and child labor research activities to the Bureau of Labor Standards.

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Amendment No. 7: Makes available, as proposed by the Senate, not to exceed \$46,000 of the appropriation of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation for expenses of the compensation Board of Appeals, instead of not to exceed \$41,000 proposed for that purpose by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Adds clarifying language to the appropriation for certification and inspection services under the Food and Drug Administration.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Appropriate \$19,842,760 for grants for further development of vocational education, as proposed by the House instead of \$29,301,740 as proposed by the Senate, and restores the language of the House bill providing for apportionment to the States to be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$19,842,760.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12: Appropriate \$1,975,600 for salaries and expenses, Office of Education, instead of \$1,860,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,009,800 as proposed by the Senate, and restore the provision of the House providing that not less than \$522,300 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education. The amount recommended for this appropriation includes \$75,600 for the surplus property donation program.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$16,000,000 for venereal diseases, Public Health Service, as proposed by the House instead of \$17,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$16,600,000 for assistance to States (general), Public Health Service, instead of \$13,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$7,350,000 for communicable diseases under the Public Health Service as proposed by the House instead of \$7,450,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House and the Senate are in agreement that only a portion of the reduction below the budget estimate should be applied to the malaria- and typhus-control programs.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$1,200,000 for administrative expenses, assistance for hospital construction, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18: Appropriate \$11,612,000 for mental-health activities of the Public Health Service, as proposed by the

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5240

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 24 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

AN ACT

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III
4 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the
5 amendments to existing law made by such title shall con-
6 tinue in effect until July 1, 1950, for the purpose of author-
7 izing the exercising, administering, and enforcing of import
8 controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing
9 materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but

1 excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and
2 rice products, upon a determination by the President that
3 such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distri-
4 bution of products in world short supply or (b) essential
5 to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks
6 owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,*
7 That such controls shall be removed as soon as the con-
8 ditions giving rise to them have ceased.

Passed the House of Representatives June 23, 1949.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

JUNE 24 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Banking and Currency

AUTHORITY TO EXERCISE IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS AND RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS

JUNE 27 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, under authority of the order of the Senate of June 27, 1949, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5240]

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5240) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The present authority of the President to control imports of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, under the provisions of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, as amended, will expire on June 30, 1949. This bill would extend such authority until July 1, 1950, to be exercised upon a determination by the President that such controls are essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Federal Government, provided that the controls are to be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.

FATS AND OILS

As a wartime program, the production of flaxseed and linseed oil was stimulated in this country by fixing a support price of \$6 per bushel for flaxseed. This enabled the Nation to obtain the linseed oil at a price below that being asked by foreign producers. However, it also resulted in accumulation of large surpluses of these commodities

by the Federal Government through the agency of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency indicates that the Commodity Credit Corporation presently holds in storage about 20,000,000 bushels of flaxseed and the equivalent of an additional 17,000,000 bushels of flaxseed in the form of 345,000,000 pounds of linseed oil. Attempts to dispose of these surpluses at prices which prevent any undue loss to the Federal Government have been proceeding. Further testimony indicates that foreign producers could land substantial quantities of linseed oil in New York City for sale at a price of about 10 cents a pound.

This would represent a loss of 17 cents a pound to the Federal Government as compared with the current domestic market price. The Department of Agriculture indicates that given additional time, it expects to be able to minimize the loss to the Government in disposing of these surpluses. The present support price paid in accordance with other laws is fixed at \$3.99 per bushel for flaxseed. The Department is hopeful that it can discourage excessive production of flaxseed and linseed oil in this country and thus make possible orderly liquidation of the surpluses of flaxseed and linseed oil now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Moreover, were import control powers on these commodities to expire on June 30, for every bushel of flaxseed acquired from foreign producers there would be an equivalent unpurchased bushel of domestic flaxseed which the Federal Government would be obliged to purchase under the price-support program. In effect this would mean that the Federal Government might be supporting a world market at the domestic support price for flaxseed.

Other fats and oils are included in the grant of authority because of testimony to the effect that they are directly or indirectly competitive with linseed oil. Their use as a substitute for linseed oil would further increase the unused supply of linseed oil and thus depress its price.

RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS

The subcommittee received testimony to the effect that there is still a short supply of rice in the world and that in order to enable this Government to carry out its obligations under international allocation of this commodity, import control authority over rice and rice products is essential. By means of import controls, adequate supplies of rice and rice products can be made available for other nations of the world. This procedure also has the result of assuring an adequate sales price for this commodity to the domestic producer.

CONCLUSION

After considering the alternatives, the committee was of the opinion that import control authority over fats and oils and rice and rice products ought to be continued for a temporary period. However, the committee believes that it should receive information periodically as to the progress the Department of Agriculture is making in reaching its objectives, the orderly liquidation of surpluses of fats and oils, and the appropriate distribution of world supplies of rice and rice products. The committee is therefore requesting the Secretary of Agri-

culture to keep it informed of such progress by the submission of written quarterly reports. The committee was inclined to include this requirement as a provision in the proposed legislation, but due to the imminent expiration of import control authority, it would be impractical to do so at this late date without jeopardizing the continuity of that authority. The inclusion of such a provision might well result in the necessity for a conference between the two Houses of Congress on this legislation and a lapse of import control authority in these fields prior to the date upon which a conference would be held and the necessary procedural steps taken resulting in a conference report. The committee is of the opinion that it can obtain the desired information under the general authority granted it in section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

This unfortunate situation arose because a current request for extension of the authority to impose import controls in these fields was not received in the Senate until very shortly before the authority is scheduled to expire. It is realized that there may be reasons for such delay, but it is felt that in matters of this nature, where legislation is requested which may have ramifications in other legislative and executive fields, committees of Congress ought to be afforded an opportunity to proceed with due deliberation, rather than be compelled by circumstances to take hasty action without a full chance to explore the possibility of dealing with the problem by means of different legislative or executive action.

The committee is of the opinion, however, that import control authority over fats and oils and rice and rice products ought not to be allowed to lapse at this time and therefore recommends the passage of the bill (H. R. 5240) as reported.



Calendar No. 591

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5240

[Report No. 593]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 24 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

JUNE 27 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Reported under authority of the order of the Senate of June 27, 1949, by Mr.
DOUGLAS, without amendment

AN ACT

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III
4 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the
5 amendments to existing law made by such title shall con-
6 tinue in effect until July 1, 1950, for the purpose of author-
7 izing the exercising, administering, and enforcing of import
8 controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing
9 materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but
10 excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and

1 rice products, upon a determination by the President that
2 such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distri-
3 bution of products in world short supply or (b) essential
4 to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks
5 owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,*
6 That such controls shall be removed as soon as the con-
7 ditions giving rise to them have ceased.

Passed the House of Representatives June 23, 1949.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

81ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5240

[Report No. 593]

AN ACT

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

JUNE 24 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Banking and Currency

JUNE 27 (legislative day, JUNE 2), 1949

Reported without amendment

Here is another paragraph:

If left to private supply and demand buying, say metal men, tin's price would likely tumble—like other nonferrous metals. Big output and declining demand this year has cut the price of lead from 21½ cents a pound to 12 cents. It has cut copper from 23½ cents to 16 cents, and zinc from 17½ to 9 cents.

Of course the producers of those articles are not enjoying the game very much, but consumers in the United States, especially the consumers of copper and copper products, are getting some benefit from it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in thorough accord with the Senator from Nebraska. I asked question after question in executive sessions of the committee in regard to stock piling critical materials, and in open session on the first and second deficiency bills, to make certain of making a saving to the taxpayers.

Mr. BUTLER. If we are ever going to reach a point at which we can begin to reduce the number of Government employees, we must take advantage of opportunities such as this. I do not know how many persons are employed in connection with this one item.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it the Senator's judgment that under the program, as outlined by the Department of Commerce, looking toward liquidation, there will be an available surplus of tin in the world market at an early date?

Mr. MAYBANK. Provided the Bolivian situation clears up.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it the opinion of the Senator that there will be no trouble about allocations in the bottling industry, and other businesses?

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe that Secretary of Commerce Sawyer will cooperate in every way possible to help small business. He has told me he would. I did not ask him about the particular question the Senator from Ohio raised, but about the other allocations. As the Senator knows, the Secretary has been reasonable in doing away with allocations.

Mr. BRICKER. That is true, and the RFC has been reasonably satisfactory and fair in the allocations heretofore made, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio raised a very important question just now. In a letter addressed to the Senator from South Carolina, which was called to my attention just now, the Secretary of Commerce, among other things, says this:

If these powers are granted, it would be my intention to use them only while serious stoppages of production affected our national security and the stock-pile objectives. Controls would be removed as soon after such interruption had ended as this could be done without undue interference with the operations of the industry.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5044) to continue for a temporary period

certain powers, authority, and discretion in respect to tin and tin products conferred upon the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the bill I wish to take this opportunity of thanking Senators on the other side of the aisle who have raised these very important questions, for agreeing not to interpose any objection, and letting the bill go through. I assure them that, so far as I am concerned, I am as anxious as any one else can be to see the controls removed as fast as possible, and I will cooperate with the Senators on the other side in discussing this matter at any time with the Secretary of Commerce, if it comes to the point where they believe something should be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 591, House bill 5240, to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils—including butter, and rice and rice products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hoey	Maybank
Baldwin	Holland	Millikin
Brewster	Ives	Mundt
Bricker	Jenner	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Chapman	Kerr	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Donnell	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Long	Stennis
Ferguson	Lucas	Taft
Flanders	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarthy	Thye
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Young
Hendrickson	Malone	
Hickenlooper	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOL- LAND in the chair). A quorum is present.

TEMPORARY PAY OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR WAGNER

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably from the Committee on Rules and Administration Senate Resolution 129 submitted today by the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] relative to temporary pay for the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by Senator WAGNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the present

consideration of the resolution, and I ask that the resolution be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I withhold my objection until after the resolution is read, so Senators will know what the resolution provides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Prior to submission of the unanimous consent for present consideration of the resolution, it will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 129), as follows:

Resolved, That the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER for service in his office and carried on the Senate pay roll at the time of his resignation from the Senate, shall be continued on such pay roll at their respective salaries for a period not to exceed 60 days, payments therefor to be made from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say I have been very glad to offer the resolution, because I think it is the only fair thing to do. I understand it is customary to adopt resolutions of this kind in the case of death, and I daresay there are probably precedents for such resolutions in cases of resignations in the past. I think the resolution should be adopted. The only thing I should like to make sure of is that the new Senator who will come from the State of New York will not be inconvenienced by the particular action proposed to be taken at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all. This is carrying out the precedents.

Mr. IVES. Very well. Since that is understood, it is all right with me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say I am fully familiar with the fact that in cases of death of a Senator such action has been customary. I should like the Senator from Arizona to cite an instance in which there has been an allowance made for payment to the office force of a Senator who has resigned.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should say that precedents with respect to death of Senators would furnish precedents for such action as is now proposed, because the circumstances are identical. There is a group of clerical assistants who must clean out the office, dispose of papers, and so on. They cannot be expected to do so without being paid. With the sudden change in their status, they are off the pay roll at this moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, there has not been a sudden change. The resignation has been under discussion for a considerable period of time. I hate at this time to object, but I should like the Senator to cite, if it is possible to do so, any cases in the history of the Senate of the United States—and there have been a number of resignations in the Senate—where this procedure has been followed, because what we do here is going to open up a precedent in case of any resignation in the future, and I think we are at least entitled to full information on that score.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am informed by reliable authority that we have done it in the past 3 years; once with respect to Senator Austin, when he resigned, and also when Senator Burton resigned to go on the Supreme Court bench.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will give me his assurance that such action has been taken previously, I will withhold any objection. Such precedents would amply justify the proposed action.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not remember the facts with respect to former Senator Burton. I do have a distinct recollection that we did take such action with respect to Senator Austin.

Mr. LUCAS. I have just been informed by reliable authority that that is true. I have not myself checked the information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator can verify that. I shall not hold up action on the matter at this hour, but can the Senator get the information to which he refers so there can be placed in the RECORD the resolution under which that was done?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall try to have that information furnished for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senate will permit, the Chair wishes to say that he is advised by the Parliamentarian that identical action was taken, by Senate Resolution 302, at the time of the resignation of Senator Austin of Vermont.

Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if either the Senator from Arizona or the Senator from Illinois could enlighten me as to what will be the status of the office force as it shall continue? To illustrate, some inquiry may come in from New York to that office. For whom does the person who responds speak or write, or how is it determined who shall make the response? In other words, what is the real status of those employees?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to point out that from some slight experience, since having been in the Senate, I believe a large share of that mail will very likely land in the office of the present Senator from New York.

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be true, but undoubtedly the administrative assistant of Senator WAGNER would reply saying, "Your letter has been received," and telling what disposition was made of it, and sign her name to it. That is all there would be to it.

Mr. DONNELL. There would be no actual official status whatsoever?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. LUCAS. There could not be. The only thing the executive assistant could do would be to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona and make reply, advising the constituent who wrote the letter of the fact that Senator WAGNER had resigned upon such and such a date, and was no longer connected with the Federal Government in any capacity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that in the case of the resignation of Senator Burton, according to the information I have in my office—and I have the same secretary whom he employed—the employees of his office were given 30 days' salary after his resignation.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise to inquire whether in the case of a resignation we have ever paid salaries for 60 days, which is what the resolution calls for. In case of another appointment, it is clear that there would be an obvious duplication of salaries for that length of time. I should like to have the information. In the absence of the information, I shall ask that the resolution go over until tomorrow, so that I may find out whether we have ever paid salaries for 60 days in the case of any resignation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state for the information of the Senate that the brief description of the resolution stated in the list of resolutions on the desk does not give that information. It will require a few minutes to develop the information.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN BILLS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess following today's session the Vice President be authorized to sign bills found to be truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is pending a unanimous-consent request by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for the present consideration of House bill 5240, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5240) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter and rice and rice products).

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the unanimous-consent request for consideration of the bill relative to fats and oils, sitting for the moment in the seat of the minority leader, I suggested the absence of a quorum, because I understood that the report of the committee was not unanimous. I note the presence in the Chamber of the Senator who, I believe was in the minority in the committee. Personally I do not object to the consideration of the bill, unless there is objection on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 5240?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the reason for this bill is approximately as follows:

During the war, in order to free ourselves from the high prices which the Argentine Republic was going to charge us for flaxseed and for linseed oil, and also to stimulate war production, a high guaranteed price was fixed on the production of American linseed, at approximately \$6 a bushel. This resulted in a large production of flaxseed, particularly in the Northwestern States—so great a production that at the prices which the Government supported the private domestic market was unable to absorb the full quantities produced.

In order to absorb the product and maintain the price, the Commodity Credit Corporation has been purchasing flaxseed and also linseed oil. I understand that it now has in stock approximately 20,000,000 bushels of flaxseed and 345,000,000 pounds of linseed oil, which is the rough equivalent of 17,000,000 more bushels of flaxseed. So it has in storage the equivalent of 37,000,000 bushels of flaxseed, whether in flaxseed or linseed oil. It has reduced the price for this year's crop from \$6 to \$3.99.

The import controls upon flaxseed expire at midnight tomorrow night. The Department of Agriculture states that producers in the Argentine would be able to lay down linseed oil in New York at 10 cents a pound, in comparison with the cost to the Government of 27½ cents a pound, and that, therefore, were the Argentine price to become the world price and were we forced to dispose of our storage of flaxseed and linseed oil, the Commodity Credit Corporation would face a maximum loss of more than \$120,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The farmers, in Minnesota, the Dakotas, and elsewhere planted flax during the war and changed their acreage to flax because the Government asked them to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The farmers would also be great sufferers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The only reason why the high price support was agreed to a year ago by the Department of Agriculture in connection with flax production was to get an increase in flax production because of the great shortage of flaxseed and linseed oil in the United States and the extremely high price which the processor was compelled to charge for the oil. Other available oils in the world were held at extremely high prices, and consequently this country could not supply the linseed oil necessary for paints. So the \$6-a-bushel support price was announced at a time when we were crying for increased production.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator from Minnesota feel that this is almost a Government obligation, because of what was told the people of Minnesota and other States in the Northwest with regard to planting flax and the Commodity Credit Corporation taking it over?

Mr. THYE. That is absolutely true. The Government is under a moral obligation to protect those who purchased flaxseed last fall at \$6 a bushel, and who now have it as a part of their inventory. Moreover, the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand a huge supply which it was compelled to purchase at \$6 a bushel in order to keep faith with its obligation to see that the producers would get \$6 a bushel for flaxseed.

In the event the Congress does not carry through and give some protection, we are not only going to break some who have high inventories of linseed oil at extremely high prices, but we are likewise going to break some who have in their inventories related oils, such as soybean oil. Furthermore, the Commodity Credit Corporation has the equivalent of 37,000,000 bushels of flaxseed, or the amount of 345,000,000 pounds of linseed oil on hand. If the Commodity Credit Corporation is thrown into competition with imported oil, it will suffer a loss of between \$120,000,000 and \$150,000,000 on the supply which it has in storage, and our own processors of linseed oil, who have this high-priced oil on hand awaiting orders from paint processors, are going to be broken. If the Congress fails to extend these oil controls for at least another year, we shall not only break faith but we shall jeopardize every creamery in the United States, because this matter affects butterfat prices as well as the prices of flaxseed and soybean oil.

Again I say, I heartily support the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his plea that the Congress extend the fat and oil controls for another year.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether the act to which he refers is broad enough to cover tung oil?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have telephoned the Department of Agriculture on that point. They say it includes tung oil, but no import licenses are at the moment required for its importation.

Mr. STENNIS. But tung oil is included?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. President, I should like to say that if the import controls are not extended, what we may likely face will be a large importation of flaxseed and linseed oil from the Argentine, which will be sold on the domestic market, and by itself will cause a price break. However, the Government has guaranteed a price of \$3.99 a bushel for flaxseed. Therefore, in order to maintain that price, the Government will be compelled to go into the domestic market and buy increased quantities of domestic flaxseed. So, in effect, the more flaxseed and linseed oil that come into the United

States from the Argentine, the greater will be the volume of purchases the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to make in order to maintain the price, and therefore the greater will be the loss which the Federal Government will sustain. In other words, we shall almost be pegging the world price of flaxseed and linseed oil—in the case of flaxseed, at \$3.99 a bushel.

This measure is a means of temporarily shutting off imports, in the hope that in the next year the United States Government will be able to work off the surplus stocks it now has. Of course there is no guaranty that it will be able to do so, but at least this measure will give the Government time in which to try.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if my information is correct, if this act is not extended, the possible cost to the Federal Government will be between \$150,000,000 and \$200,000,000, because it is anticipated that Argentina will ship to the United States linseed oil at 10 cents a pound. Of course, this is but another example of how the so-called planned economy has failed to work. In this case, oils will be shipped to the United States from foreign countries, thus reducing the price in the United States by no one knows how much. However, it is anticipated that it will cost the Federal Government between \$150,000,000 and \$200,000,000, if this measure is not extended for possibly another year. I repeat that this is another case showing how a planned economy fails to work.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think I should make a further announcement: If on tomorrow the Senate concludes action on the unfinished business, the national labor bill, a motion will be made to take up the North Atlantic Pact, and it will be made the unfinished business.

Of course, as I have said before, on Friday we shall take a recess until the following Tuesday.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Do I correctly understand that debate on the North Atlantic Pact will not begin tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. No; we shall merely take it up then, and then on Friday take a recess until Tuesday, to proceed with it at that time.

I may say that some very important appropriation bills will be coming along, and probably we shall have to obtain unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the North Atlantic Pact, in order to consider those appropriation bills next week.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, last January, when we were discussing the hearings in connection with amendments

to the Taft-Hartley law, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had this to say:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that in my judgment the arguments he made against the Taft-Hartley law at the time when the fight against the bill was occurring on the floor of the Senate, were sound. I joined with him then in those arguments. I join with him now in those arguments. But I say to the Senator from Florida that, the way to get good legislation is not to follow the procedural course which the Senator from Florida is primarily responsible for in this matter. I say that because the Senator's procedure is going to result in a fight here on the floor of the Senate, resulting in an attempt to write a piece of labor legislation on the floor of the Senate. We cannot write good labor legislation here on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President. So I do not propose to let the Senator from Florida "get by," so far as American labor is concerned, with any representation that the committee procedure for which he, up to this hour, is chiefly responsible insofar as the handling of labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress is concerned, meets the best interest of American labor. I say to American labor here and now that the weeks immediately ahead will demonstrate that the course of action for which the Senator from Florida is responsible constitutes a great disservice to American labor. I hope we can persuade the Democrats in committee meetings to change the timetable they have adopted so that we can have fair hearings on this issue of labor legislation. Whether I am right or wrong depends on whether or not we are going to consider the problems, issue by issue, which must be taken up in order to have a fair piece of labor legislation passed by this Congress. Mr. President, we cannot possibly have fair consideration of the issues I wish to raise here this afternoon by any such timetable as that which the Senator from Florida has been able to get the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to adopt.

At that time we were discussing how long a time would be devoted to the hearings on the proposed amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. I remember that afterward, when the committee made its report, the Senator from Oregon made substantially the same statement, namely, to the effect that we were going to have to write labor legislation right here on the floor of the Senate. Mr. President, he was a better prophet than even he thought he was at that particular time.

It is a matter of keen regret to the junior Senator from Connecticut that we have to vote on the proposed Taft substitute tomorrow at 2 o'clock. It seems to me that the proposed Taft substitute represents the very sincere and earnest efforts of the minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Senate will recall that at the time of the earlier proceedings, a part of which I have read from the RECORD, we had under discussion the question of how much time would be devoted to the hearings. The position of the majority party in the Senate at that time was, that since there had been a mandate in the election of 1948, very little if any time should be given to hearings in the matter of amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, that it should be repealed in toto, and that no time should be spent on hearings. After considerable discussion and argument, the timetable

was advanced and there were extended hearings.

Thereafter, as I recall, after the close of the hearings, the committee adjourned for a week, and then met, for what at least the minority members supposed was going to be an opportunity to consider amendments offered by the minority, or offered by any member of the committee. What happened, Mr. President? I think it is well to recall it at this time, because it is responsible for the dilemma in which we now find ourselves. What happened was that the committee met, and the majority of the committee voted to report, without any consideration in executive session whatever, the Thomas-Lesinski bill, or Thomas bill. After extended hearings, at which there was a great deal of testimony taken, and after earnest efforts on the part of the minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to secure an opportunity to suggest amendments, the Thomas bill was reported exactly as it had been introduced, as the junior Senator from Connecticut remembers. It was at that particular time that again the junior Senator from Oregon pointed out the fact that what we were going to have to do was to write labor legislation on the floor of the Senate or else repeal the Taft-Hartley Act outright.

There were some things in the Taft-Hartley Act which experience proved worked beneficially and well. There were other things in the Taft-Hartley Act which did not work so well. Those who drew the act foresaw that possibility, and provided a study committee to examine the operation of the act, to submit reports, and to recommend proposed changes.

Apparently the work of that committee, apparently the work of the minority, has gone practically for naught. As a result of the decision here today, by unanimous consent, that we are to vote tomorrow at 2 o'clock on the question of whether or not we adopt in a single package the proposed Taft substitute, the matter has already been decided.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the statement that the work of the minority went for naught is not true. As soon as the action was taken by the majority, I called a meeting of all the minority members who had voted against the action of the committee. We spent weeks in working on a bill, with the assistance and advice of the counsel who had been the counsel for the joint committee, and who is now one of the experts on the committee itself. We went through all the evidence, we went through all the objections. We proposed, as the Senator knows, some 28 amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. So the pending amendment is, in effect, a report of a committee which considered the bill far more carefully than the majority of the committee considered the Thomas bill. I think it is wrong for us to say that the work of the minority went for naught, because what has now been offered is a carefully considered bill which deals with practically all the

substantial objections made in the committee, on the evidence, and it is in effect a report of the minority of three of the Republican members. The other two sat in, joined in some things but not in all, and therefore these amendments or this substitute has had exactly the consideration which any bill gets from a committee of the Senate. I am sure those who had considered it for many months last year and many months this year heard the evidence and had the best advice.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I may say I probably did not make myself clear. What I meant to say, and the thought I meant to convey, was that so far as the bill reported by the committee was concerned, the efforts of the minority really went for naught, because not a single one of its suggestions was included in that bill. That bill was introduced into the Senate, was referred to the committee, extended hearings were held, and it was then reported to the Senate as though no hearings had been held, and as though no executive consideration was ever given to the bill.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BALDWIN. May I add one thing before I yield?

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say, Mr. President, that we are in precisely the situation the junior Senator from Oregon at the time predicted we would be in, of trying to write on the floor of the Senate a very comprehensive labor bill. It is a matter of keen regret to the junior Senator from Connecticut that we are going to have to vote on the Taft substitute tomorrow, because there are several amendments which the junior Senator from Connecticut would like to have had presented and would like to have had discussed at great length. The junior Senator from New York had a number of amendments that he intended to propose, and a number of other amendments have already been put into the Thomas-Lesinski bill, to which the Republican ranking member of the committee has agreed. However, there are some of the provisions in his substitute which would change the amendments which have already been agreed upon. So, Mr. President, it seems to the junior Senator from Connecticut that we find ourselves in considerable confusion, at least the junior Senator from Connecticut finds himself in some confusion, as to just where we are, and he believes that the forecast of the junior Senator from Oregon was correct. We have tried to write on the floor of the Senate a labor bill, to good effect and good purpose it seems to me, insofar as we have gone. I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will permit, I should like to note at this time the fact, supplementing what the Senator from Ohio has stated, that on May 4 there was ordered to be printed a copy of the minority views, joined in by three of the minority, to which is appended a statement by a fourth member of the

minority. The minority views, so expressed, embrace more than 90 pages of printed matter. Therefore, I think it is true, as the Senator from Ohio has said, that not only has the amendment been prepared, but somewhat extensive minority views were the outcome of the work of the members of the minority, following the treatment of the subject by the committee itself.

I should like to have the RECORD show that the report to which I refer is report 99, part 2, Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. I agree heartily with what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has said, and I make the point again that it is too bad that the committee as a whole in executive session could not have had the advantage of this very extensive work.

Mr. DONNELL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. It seems to me we have departed from what should be the normal, proper procedure in the drafting of a bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry on the subject of amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. May amendments to the substitute be offered tomorrow, prior to 2 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that if Senators who have control of the time yield time to Senators who wish to offer amendments to the Taft substitute, they will be in order.

Mr. TAFT. Then, Mr. President, I should like to make the statement that I shall yield such time to any Senator who is not able to prepare his amendment this evening and who desires to offer it before 2 o'clock tomorrow.

I wish to assure the Senator from Connecticut that no amendment is being shut out. I sympathize with the Senator's statement that the time for debate was limited. That was only because I hoped that we would get 10 minutes after 2 o'clock. I am sorry that the time is so short, but that was the unanimous-consent request made. Of course, the Senator could have objected, as I might have. But so far as the offering of amendments is concerned, any amendments which the Senator wishes to offer may be offered tomorrow before 2 o'clock. Some of them may be entirely acceptable to the authors of the substitute.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio for making the parliamentary inquiry, which is substantially the point I had intended to make myself; so that I have the answer to my question, without having propounded the question myself.

I should like at this time to offer two amendments to the Taft substitute, one in behalf of myself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and

Mr. HAYDEN. They have been satisfied.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the explanation?

Mr. HAYDEN. There are only seven employees affected, and if all of them remain on the pay roll for the entire 60 days, which of course they would not do if they could get work elsewhere, the cost to the United States would be \$3,500. I obtained that information from the financial clerk of the Senate. I also obtained information for him to the effect that during the past few years, since the Reorganization Act went into effect, Senator Wagner never did fill his clerical force, which resulted in a saving of \$24,278 in base pay. So it seems to me this is a fair arrangement, and one which should be made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think that one of the objections raised yesterday was that the period covered in the resolution was 60 days, instead of 30 days, as is usual. From the observations made to him, is it the Senator's feeling that since the amount is small, it comes within the amounts which have been expended prior to this time for periods of 30 days?

Mr. HAYDEN. Probably it would not extend 60 days. The rule provides that if a Senator dies his employees shall not remain on the roll more than 60 days.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to ascertain whether we are establishing a precedent. We have a general rule that when a Senator is deceased his staff may remain on the Senate pay roll for a period up to 60 days. Now we are asked to take action in the case of a Senator who has resigned. There will be other Senators resigning from this body. I desire to know whether we are making this a general rule, or what is being done. Why should we follow the other rule in the case of Senator Wagner? We may be getting on dangerous ground.

Mr. HAYDEN. The last instance was the case of Senator Austin, who prior to his resignation submitted a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and unanimously reported by that committee. The resolution provided that Senator Austin's office employees should be paid their salaries for as much as 60 days. The terms of that resolution were the same as the terms of the pending resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was not aware of the fact that we had done that before with respect to a Senator who resigned.

Mr. HAYDEN. That question was raised yesterday by other Senators, and on inquiry made by them they were satisfied on that point.

Mr. BRIDGES. If we have done it before, our action now would not be establishing a new precedent. I trust there will be no discrimination against the office force of any Senator who in the future may resign. With that understanding I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 129) was considered and agreed to.

EXTENSION OF IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to Calendar No. 591, House bill 5240, to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils—including butter—and rice and rice products.

Request was made for consideration of the bill last evening, but on objection it went over. It will cost the Commodity Credit Corporation and the taxpayers of the United States \$125,000,000 if the bill is not passed. It is a bill which deals with certain oil products, primarily raised in the great midwestern section of the country.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5240) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does it require unanimous consent for consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not ask unanimous consent. I moved to have the bill taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair begs the pardon of the Senator from South Carolina. The Chair thought he asked unanimous consent for present consideration.

Mr. MAYBANK. No. Unanimous consent was requested yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was told by the distinguished majority leader a few moments ago that request might be made to bring up the bill, but I also was told on the floor earlier that after the labor bill had been disposed of, it was proposed to make the Atlantic Pact the unfinished business. Two or three Senators are interested in the bill referred to by the Senator from South Carolina. They are not on the floor of the Senate now.

Mr. MAYBANK. There will be quite some debate on the bill. I wish to say that the law expires tonight at midnight. I have never made any statement respecting it other than that I intended to call up the bill for consideration before the expiration time. The bill was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. It was debated for a considerable time yesterday afternoon. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] objected to unanimous consent being granted for consideration of the bill yesterday. A number of Senators from the Midwest seem to be particularly interested in the bill. The Senators from the two Dakotas, from

Minnesota, and from other States are interested in it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is not asking unanimous consent for present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has moved to take up the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. There is so much interest in the bill that I believe we should have a quorum before taking it up.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator wishes to make an explanation, I hope he will do so, and give us time to see if we can get a sufficient number of members on the floor to make a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may suggest that there is not much explanation to be made of the bill. The bill was explained yesterday. I understand both Senators from Minnesota, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and some other Senators desire to discuss it. If they desire a quorum call before they discuss it, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if only a short explanation is necessary, I believe we should have a quorum present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator withhold the suggestion for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask that I may yield to my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor thereby, so he may ask to have a bill considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is suggested that action be taken on the pending motion made by the senior Senator from South Carolina for the present consideration of House bill 5240.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I object. I wish to say that I shall vote against such a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator again withhold his suggestion?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. My colleague from South Carolina desires to make a unanimous-consent request.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN INEQUITIES IN PAY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from South Carolina may not lose the floor while I ask to report a bill and request its immediate consideration. I believe it will require only 2 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before I waive my objection I should like to know what we are getting into. What sort of a bill is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from South Carolina has asked unanimous consent to report a bill and ask for its present consideration, and that his colleague may not lose the floor by his doing so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the unanimous consent request is that the junior Senator may be permitted to report a bill and ask for its present consideration, and that the right of the senior Senator from South Carolina may not be prejudiced thereby. Senators will have the right to object if unanimous consent is asked by the junior Senator from South Carolina for present consideration in the event they do not want to have the bill taken up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The present unanimous consent request is merely that the Senator be allowed to report the bill and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. Is there objection to the request that the Senator may report the bill? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I report favorably, without amendment, House bill 5100, to correct inequities in the pay of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 604) thereon.

The bill was passed by the House and unanimously reported today by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Today is the last day of the fiscal year. It was brought out that a technical point might be raised with respect to this bill if it were not passed today.

Last year there was considerable discussion, on the floor, of the subject dealt with in the bill, and it was agreed that if revenues were produced for the District in sufficient amount, the District of Columbia employees would receive an increase of \$330 in their salaries, as the salaries of classified Federal workers throughout the United States were increased. A bill providing revenues for the District of Columbia has been passed by the Senate and the House and signed by the President. The Congress has already authorized payment to the unclassified workers. The bill provides for payment to the classified workers within the District. That is all there is to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the authorization was passed in the last Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. It was said that when sufficient revenue to provide the needed amount was produced in the District of Columbia the increased payment would be made to the District workers.

Mr. WHERRY. Since the District of Columbia sales tax and other sources of revenue have gone into effect the amounts necessary are available, and the time has arrived when the payments can be made. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. WHERRY. Did all the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service join in reporting the bill? Was there any opposition?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Every member who was present agreed to it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator says "Every member who was present." Was there a good attendance at the meeting?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I remember, eight members were present. I have talked with several members who were not present, and all of them with whom I have talked have agreed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am a member of the committee. I was present at the time the bill was under consideration. More than a majority of the members of the committee were present, and there was a goodly representation from both sides of the aisle. This is a good piece of legislation, and should be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5100) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McKellar
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Bricker	Hill	Maybank
Bridges	Hoey	Morse
Butler	Holland	Mundt
Byrd	Humphrey	Murray
Cain	Ives	Myers
Chapman	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kefauver	Sparkman
Eaton	Kem	Stennis
Ferguson	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
George	Long	Thye
Gillette	Lucas	Tydings
Graham	McCarran	Wherry
Green	McCarthy	Wiley
Gurney	McFarland	Williams
Hayden	McGrath	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

EXTENSION OF IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask that my motion be put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to proceed to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5240) to continue for a temporary period certain power, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter, and rice and rice products).

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I do not care to delay a vote on this measure. I merely wish to speak long enough to let the issues be known, to state the facts for the RECORD, and to state my position on this matter.

In the first place, no hearing was held on this bill, except a short hearing held on Friday of last week. Just a week before the termination date of the bill now in effect, the Department sent its representatives before the Banking and Currency Committee, and they asked for a continuance of the controls. I say they did so without an adequate hearing or an understanding of the facts on the part of the members of the committee.

This is an effort to prevent the importation of linseed oil and fats and oils, but primarily linseed oil, and also rice and rice products. The philosophy back of the prevention of the importation of linseed oil and fats and oils is that we have an oversupply. The philosophy back of the prevention of the importation of rice and rice products is that we have an undersupply. In one case the rule is supposed to work in one way, and in the other case it is supposed to work in the other way.

I am opposed as a matter of principle to putting an embargo on the importation of products into this country. There is a better, safer, and sounder way to handle the matter. If we are to submit to this kind of pressure from the departments, it means that whenever a surplus is purchased by the Government, whether at a reasonable price or at a high price, the Congress will be called upon to bail out the department which has spent the taxpayers' money, but the consumers will get no benefit whatsoever from the surplus products thus purchased and held by the Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio how this theory of government could be reconciled with the administration's theory of reciprocal trade agreements with no peril point.

Mr. BRICKER. No reconciliation is possible. Likewise, I wish to say to our good friends from the South who believe in free trade and to those on the administration side who have adopted that as their philosophy—as has been explained here time and time again by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]—that I cannot comprehend how they could possibly support a measure of this kind, which does not mean free trade or any trade at all, but simply says that the administration shall have the power to shut off imports in these fields because, in one case, we have too much oil and, in the other case, we do not have enough rice.

Mr. President, it does not make sense or add up to any sort of policy of trade—free, protected, or otherwise. This, in my judgment, is the most contradictory proposal that has come before the Congress thus far.

What are the facts? A few years ago the Department found there was a shortage of linseed oil. As a result, they analyzed the situation, and found the shortage of flax to be more critical than it really was. The support price was increased to \$6, rather than \$3.99 or \$4, which is the price at the present time.

and which in my judgment should have been the ceiling price at all times. So the farmers of the country responded magnificently, as they always do, to a price inducement of that kind. The acreage increased tremendously and likewise the crop. The Commodity Credit Corporation had to expend millions of the taxpayers' dollars—yes, hundreds of millions—in order to buy the surplus crop at \$6. The Corporation acquired too much flaxseed and linseed oil, with the result that the next year they cut down the support price to \$4, or \$3.99. But the farmers, seeing that flax is an easy crop to grow, that it is an easy crop to harvest and to handle, continued their acreage, with the result that the Government today has on hand in storage about three-quarters of an annual crop, a supply which ought to be available to the American consumer and ought to be of some benefit to the American producer of commodities which require linseed oil. But the price is to be held up in order to bail out the Commodity Credit Corporation because of the overprice which they paid, as a result of which they brought about an overproduction, so that now they have on their hands a surplus, which they must sell. This is a measure to protect a Government agency which has followed an uneconomic and unsound principle of support control.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. In view of the statement the Senator has just made, may I ask, is not this theory of the Government directly contrary to the theory of the Brannan plan of making commodities available to the consumer at cheap prices?

Mr. BRICKER. It does not conform to any plan, much less the Brannan plan. As I said a moment ago, I do not see how one who believes in free trade can support it. I do not see how one who believes in a protective tariff can support it. I do not see how one who believes in the Brannan plan can support it. It is an anomaly so far as agricultural economics is concerned in this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have only this to say to my good friend on the committee. Of course, some of the things he has said are absolutely correct. But we are only asking for an extension for 1 year, because the Commodity Credit Corporation had to purchase certain quantities of flaxseed, in view of the conditions which the Senator has explained. We were in a war at the time, and we needed it. The Argentine wanted 35 cents a pound for it.

Mr. BRICKER. The war was all over when the support price of \$6 was established in this country. It was done in an effort to prevent the farmers of Argentina and the Government of Argentina—

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. THYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The support price was put into effect during the war, as an inducement to American farmers to produce flaxseed, which we were unable to get in sufficient quantity at that time. Although I am not an expert on flaxseed, which is raised in the Middle West, that is the information that was sent to the committee by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BRICKER. But the volume that is now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation and in Government storage was purchased I think in either 1946 or 1947, at the high support price of \$6. Last year the support price was reduced to \$3.99.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am very reluctant to interrupt the discussion of the able junior Senator from Ohio. I should rather be agreeing with him than disagreeing. I know of his ability and I know of his sincerity, and for that reason I am reluctant to interrupt him, but I must call attention, if the Senator will yield sufficiently long for me to make an explanation—

Mr. BRICKER. If the Senator will permit me, I should rather continue. I only have another minute or two, and then I shall yield the floor to the Senator from Minnesota. I have to catch a plane in just a little while.

Mr. THYE. I shall not interrupt.

Mr. BRICKER. I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. THYE. I shall not interrupt. I hope the Senator catches his plane and that he enjoys the Fourth of July celebration. I find it necessary to remain here. I wish I could catch a plane, too.

Mr. BRICKER. If I do not catch the plane, I will not enjoy it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, that about concludes my statement, except to say that this bill, if passed, will put the consumer price about 200 percent above what an unpegged price would be. The American consumer will have to pay for the mistakes which were made by the Government in the fixing of an unsound support price.

First of all, this is a dangerous and an unsound precedent to set, because just so soon as any commodity in this country comes into surplus supply, immediately special interests that are involved in production will be coming before the Congress of the United States saying to us, "Stop imports, because we have got more than we need in this country." If we are going to enter into that kind of program of state control of production, trade, and commerce, not only internationally but domestically, let us do so with our eyes open. That is one reason I wanted this bill to go over until next week, so we could have a thorough analysis, both in respect to the commodities mentioned in the bill and in respect

to whatever other products are in oversupply, the producers of which are likely to come to the Congress and ask for state control or state trading so far as production is concerned in the United States.

As I say, it is an inconsistent, incongruous application of an unsound principle so far as the trade of the United States or international trade relationships are concerned. It does not conform to the free-trade philosophy. It does not conform to any philosophy of a protective tariff. It does not conform to the Brannan bill or any other practice the Government has heretofore followed. I shall not ask for the yeas and nays on this question, but I want to be recorded as opposing this kind of legislation for the protection of special interests in the United States.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President I dislike to disagree with my good friend from Ohio, but I do not believe he is fully conversant with the facts in this instance. During the war, and all through 1946 and 1947, the Argentine Government was holding us up for as much as \$8 a bushel for flax. Ordinarily, in peacetime, unfortunately, our tariff on flax was so low that two-thirds of our United States requirements had to be imported from the Argentine. As a result, our production was far below our needs. In order to alleviate a desperate shortage in the United States, the Department of Agriculture raised support levels on flax to \$6 a bushel, and under that program the farmers increased production of flax to an extent we thought was impossible. My State of North Dakota is the greatest flax-producing State in the Nation. We came through with a crop of approximately one-third or more greater in yield, for the number of acres seeded, than we ever had before. This was largely because of very favorable weather conditions, new varieties of flax, and new methods of growing flax. I disagree with the Senator from Ohio when he says flax is an easy crop to raise. Flax is the most hazardous crop that anyone can raise. It is more subject to grasshopper destruction; it is more subject to disease and every other hazard than any other crop I know of. In fact, the price of flax must be double the price of wheat, if we are to successfully raise the flax from year to year. The fact that we were very lucky in getting large yields of flax last year does not mean we are going to continue that for years to come. I believe the average flax production in our State in normal times—and ours is the principal flax-producing State—was not over 5 or 6 bushels an acre. Last year our average yield was probably 12 bushels an acre—an unusual thing. I believe the bill is necessary in order to protect our investment and the flax growers of this Nation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, once more let me say that I should like to agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] in his objection to favorable action on the bill, but I do not believe anyone could justly criticize the Commodity Credit Corporation for the quantity of flaxseed and linseed oil it has acquired in the support price program. The Com-

modity Credit Corporation has approximately 7,000,000 bushels of flaxseed which it was compelled to purchase a year ago and in the previous year in the general support-price program. It may be asked, Why did it place the support price at \$6 a bushel? Why not at a lower figure? The fact of the matter is that it is an aftermath of war, a situation following a war period. We were confronted with a terrific shortage of linseed oil and other oils during the war. The Corporation paid a high support price on soybeans as well as on flaxseed, and after having placed the support price at this level and the crop came in and the processor was purchasing the flaxseed, the Commodity Credit Corporation had to step in in order to maintain the support price in the manner to which it had committed itself at an earlier time or at the planting season of the year.

I believe the Congress is absolutely justified in continuing the supports for 1 more year. Unless that be done, Congress will be instrumental in causing the Commodity Credit Corporation to lose possibly \$160,000,000 which it presently has invested in flaxseed and linseed oil.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Since this is the result of the program, will not the taxpayers have to make up the difference, and by passing this bill the consumers of the product will take care of it in the normal channels of trade?

Mr. THYE. That is absolutely true. If this legislation is passed it will enable us to work ourselves out of a situation in which we have more oil at the present time than would normally move. In the event controls were removed, we would immediately have imports of oils and fats which would absolutely demoralize the market, not only in linseed oil but also in soybean oil, which would have a reflex effect upon cottonseed oil and other oils.

Mr. MUNDT. And the taxpayers would have to make up for the amount invested by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. THYE. That is true. We might jeopardize the entire agricultural program in the next 4 or 5 months in the event controls should be removed and there should be an influx of oils and fats.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington is one of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee, and, in reference to the question now before the Senate, he voted to extend controls for a year, but only for one reason. The reason was that he wanted to protect the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation which lost, as we were told, more than \$100,000,000. But the junior Senator from Washington, in common with other members of the Banking and Currency Committee, shares the indignation as expressed a few minutes ago by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] over the way in which the measure was presented to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and over the way in which legislation in the past has apparently not operated to the satisfac-

tion of a number of Members of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio pointed out that there were no adequate hearings held on the extension proposal and that no record was written, and, by inference, he suggested that we have one more reason to believe that the Commodity Credit Corporation will not be in a comfortable position a year from now, as is the fact today.

In connection with that observation, Mr. President, I wonder if the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. MAYBANK] will permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be glad to have the Senator ask me a question.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if there is any wisdom in the suggestion that we might extend these controls for a limited period, say, 30 or 45 days, to make certain at the outset that the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation would not be held in jeopardy, and, secondly, and most important, to give us an opportunity to anticipate the control requirements of the future, and to determine the programs, if any, which the Commodity Credit Corporation have in hand to reduce their surpluses and to make it possible for us to do away with the controls approximately a year from now.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, of course I feel just as the Senator from Washington does, and just as the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] does, that it would perhaps be best to extend the controls for 6 months, and then do away with them as quickly as possible. But the question arises that they will expire tonight if we do not extend them and we cannot have a conference with the House and pass a law between now and midnight which would take the place of the extension now proposed. I might say to the Senator that I shall join with him and with the Senator from Illinois, because I believe the Senator from Illinois feels as I do, in having a careful check made through the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and in asking the Commodity Credit Corporation to liquidate what I believe are obligations to the farmers of the Midwest as quickly as possible. That would be my answer, because I do not believe in controls, and I do not want the Senator to think that I do.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the information the Senator has just given. I wonder if the chairman of the committee would care to state to the Senate why the Commodity Credit Corporation was so extremely, and from our point of view, unnecessarily tardy in presenting this important matter before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Illinois said in no uncertain terms that he regarded the delay of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the delay of the Department of Agriculture in reporting to the Senate, as very regrettable. As I told the Senator from Vermont yesterday when he raised the question of the controls or so-called allocations of pork and pork products, I

asked the Department of Agriculture this morning to send me a full report, and advised them I had been extremely disappointed. They have sent a report, which will appear in the RECORD tomorrow morning, since I presented it today, asking that controls be completely removed. The substance of the letters and the correspondence regarding this matter was that the controls would be removed as soon as possible, and that no additional "hold-up," if I may use that term, or delay, would be encountered.

I cannot speak for the Secretary of Agriculture, I cannot speak for the Department of Agriculture, but I thoroughly agree with everything the Senator from Illinois said here yesterday and day before yesterday to the effect that this delay—this tardiness, as the Senator from Washington expresses it—was uncalled for and unnecessary.

I may add that the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which committee the distinguished Senator from Washington is a member, will use every effort to expedite doing away with controls as soon as possible, and at the same time save money for the American taxpayers, who have this investment in the Commodity Credit Corporation flax seed oil situation in the Midwest and Northwest.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I am hopeful that the Senator from Illinois will answer a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. If we have on hand, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, as I understand, approximately three-fourths of an annual crop, what assurance did the Commodity Credit Corporation give to the Senator from Illinois, if I may inquire, as to how they intended to dispose of that surplus, and would it in fact be largely disposed of by the expiration date fixed in the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture could give no definite assurance that this surplus stock would be worked off. They had hoped they would be able to dispose of some of the existing stock to ECA and some to the Army, but they were not able to get as large purchases made as they had hoped, and I would say that, so far as the future is concerned, they hope, but they cannot guarantee.

Mr. CAIN. How long a period of extension did the Department of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation ask for when the matter was presented to the conference?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They originally asked for a year and a half, but that was reduced by the House to 1 year.

If I may follow up a question which the Senator from Washington asked earlier in his colloquy with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, namely, what harm would be done if we merely renewed the 30-day provision, the Senator from South Carolina made a very important point, that altering the terms of the extension made by the House would require the bill to go to conference, and probably, therefore, would result in the act expiring, and large quantities of lin-

seed oil being shipped in, beginning tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington is conscious of that fact, and is anxious to have this legislation promptly disposed of. I think those of us on the committee, at least, are in agreement that we would like to make such action unnecessary in the future, if it is humanly possible to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the hearings I tried to make it as clear to the Department of Agriculture as I could that I felt they had been very negligent in not bringing this matter up before the 20th of June. They furnished us with incomplete information, and I think they have a great deal to answer for in the way they have conducted the whole matter. Nevertheless, as Grover Cleveland said, it is a condition and not a theory which confronts us, and we have the problem as to what we should do.

My feeling is that if we allow the controls to lapse there will in all probability be large shipments of linseed oil and flaxseed from the Argentine, with the result that we will be compelled to purchase a larger and larger fraction of the domestic supply, so that our stocks will increase, and our ultimate loss will be greater, and in effect we will be supporting the world price of flaxseed at our present ratio of \$3.99 a bushel. Therefore, in spite of the way in which the Department of Agriculture has conducted the matter, it seems to me better that we renew the controls for a year.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from South Carolina or the Senator from Illinois, whoever is handling the bill on the floor, I should like to ask whether it is possible under the bill to give any protection to the tung oil industry. I have in mind the question whether the bill would allow the exercising of controls over imports of tung oil which come into this country from China. I make the inquiry because, as other Senators will attest—and I see the Senator from Mississippi on the floor, and I know other southern Senators are vitally interested—bankruptcy threatens the tung oil industry of the South.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill will be of assistance.

Mr. PEPPER. It will give authority to the President, or the proper agency of the Government, to examine into the volume of tung oil that is coming into this country, its adverse effect upon the domestic industry, and that the Government might administratively, under the bill, if it becomes law, give some protection to the tung-oil industry.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I am certainly indebted to the Senator and all those who have made that possible, and I am glad that the record of this debate can show that tung oil can have protection under the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take the liberty of associating myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and

the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

I want to make this observation in reference to H. R. 5240: That back in the fall of the past year, 1948, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased large amounts of flax, and purchased it at the support price of approximately \$6 a bushel. I think it should also be noted that that crop was planted at a time when there was a great shortage of linseed oil and of flax products.

Flax is a risk crop, one which is always in jeopardy, and the farmers of our section of the country were called upon, as was pointed out, to plant this risk crop in behalf of the national defense. Surely they are worthy of having the time properly to adjust their marketing and their planting operations.

Furthermore, when the Commodity Credit Corporation underwrote the price at approximately \$6 a bushel, a large number of private processors were compelled to go into the market and pay that price. They have heavy inventories, and anything which at this time would prejudice those inventories precipitously would have a very serious effect upon the industry. It is for those reasons, along with the fact that I do not believe that the Commodity Credit Corporation ought to suffer undue losses, that I join with other Senators in supporting H. R. 5240 and ask for its favorable consideration and passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to proceed to consideration of House bill 5240.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5240) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5240) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE ECONOMY-MINDED SENATE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial which was printed in the New York Times this morning, entitled "The Economy-Minded Senate." It begins as follows:

Sixty-two Members of the Senate are now lined up in support of action at the earliest practicable date on a resolution to direct the President to cut 5 to 10 percent from the budget which they themselves have voted, or are in process of voting. If there was ever a clear case of passing the buck in Washington, this is it. The Senate added nearly a half-billion dollars to the first five regular appropriation bills to come to it from the House of Representatives. Yet 62 Members of the Senate are strong for economy—provided somebody else achieves it.

Then the editorial proceeds further to develop the subject.

Mr. President, I was one of the Senators who supported each effort which has been made in this session to reduce appropriations. I am also, however, conscious of my oath to support the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution clearly lays down standards for the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government. Never, so long as I am a Member of the Senate, will I cast a vote to abdicate the rights of the Senate of the United States, or, moreover, to avoid its duties.

A little more than a year ago there was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] a measure in which he proposed an impingement—at least, I deemed it such—on the rights of the Executive in connection with a matter having to do with calling for the FBI files for the inspection of the Senate. I led the fight against it, and I led the fight to sustain the President's veto. That was the only veto by President Truman which was sustained in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. President, if the Senate should adopt this resolution it will have performed what I regard as a shameful act. When it comes up for consideration I intend to have my say about it, and I shall speak more at length and shall review the history of the action.

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the editorial from which I have read be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECONOMY-MINDED SENATE

Sixty-two Members of the Senate are now lined up in support of action at the earliest practicable date on a resolution to direct the President to cut 5 to 10 percent from the budget which they themselves have voted, or are in process of voting. If there was ever a clear case of passing the buck in Washington, this is it. The Senate added nearly a half billion dollars to the first five regular appropriation bills to come to it from the House of Representatives. Yet 62 Members of the Senate are strong for economy—provided somebody else achieves it. When Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, proposed to cut 40 percent from that old stand-by, the rivers and harbors bill—which carries many meritorious appropriations but also large chunks of political pork—he was able to muster only 14 votes in support of his motion. But more than 4 times 14 Members of the Senate are now ready to dump on the President's desk a problem which they themselves lack courage or ability to handle.

This approach to the problem is not only an abdication of the Senate's own responsibilities; it is also likely, if adopted, to fall far short of its goal of effecting a saving of \$4,000,000,000 in the new fiscal year which begins tomorrow. This is because a large part of the budget is beyond the reach of the directive to the President which the Senate is now considering. The budget carries \$5,500,000,000 for interest on the national debt, an item which cannot be reduced; it carries \$2,500,000,000 for grants to the States, all authorized by existing law; it carries \$2,100,000,000 for veterans, a sum incapable of being cut substantially until Congress itself revises its own laws regarding the benefits now being paid in non-service-connected causes; it carries \$14,200,000,000 for national defense and \$6,700,000,000 to meet our present international obligations, and while some

economies are possible this would be a poor time to cut expenditures drastically at either of these points. There remains about \$10,000,000 of proposed expenditures for all other purposes of Government. A directed cut of 10 percent limited to this section of the budget would fall far short of the \$4,000,000,000 economy now hopefully in view.

These figures lead us back to the starting point, which is that the only sure way to cut the budget is to face the issue squarely, in committee and on the floors of Congress.

WHAT IS RIGHT WITH AMERICA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for the past several months, as time and opportunity have permitted, I have been addressing different groups of distinguished Americans to the effect that if our American success formula of political independence and the private competitive enterprise system is to win the contest against world socialism, collectivism, and communism, it is imperative that at the grass-roots level private citizens begin energetically to claim and defend the basic elements upon which our great success has been founded.

As one specific recommendation indicating what citizens in their local communities can do to help our American way of life to endure and expand, I have proposed that in each public school there be included a capsule course in clear and constructive terms which could honestly, accurately, and appropriately, be called a course in what is right with America. We all agree America is not utopia. There are and always will be many things to be corrected and improved. However, Mr. President, it is also true that ordinary human beings in the United States are given greater opportunities, higher standards of living, more freedom, and better security than they have received in any other area of the world or in any era of history. It is my position that in every school we should recognize this fact and provide at least one course of instruction which will teach children to understand, to appreciate, and to support the basic formula of political and economic activity which has made the unprecedented and unparalleled record possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks an editorial from the Star-Courier, a daily newspaper published in the typical American community of Kewanee, Ill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH UNITED STATES

In a recent address before the national conference of small-business men in Washington, South Dakota's Senator KARL MUNDT announced that he was initiating a one man crusade to sell Americans on the superiority of the American way of life.

His efforts will be directed at inducing chambers of commerce, luncheon clubs, women's clubs, and other organizations to establish what he called "American enterprise committees" among the standing and working committees of their organizations.

The Dakota man, serving his first term in the Senate after an extended period of service in the lower House, outlined what he conceived to be the opportunities and responsibilities of these American enterprise committees.

"Creeping collectivism at home must be resisted," he asserted, "at the local level by private citizens uniting in their community-by-community efforts fully as much as it is necessary to repel these freedom-denying movements by national and international action.

"If every community in America will rid itself of the insidious dangers of collectivism and educate its youth and adult citizens to understand and appreciate the values and virtues of our American enterprise system, we can so strengthen ourselves domestically that our international influence will be correspondingly increased.

"Local committees should crusade unceasingly to portray and improve the functions of the basic formula which has made America great, namely, political independence and private enterprise. Once these two factors of our American success formula are fully accepted and appreciated by every citizen, it will be comparatively easy to repel foreign ideologies which attack their operation or decrease their effectiveness."

In suggesting things to do for these local-level American enterprise committees, Senator MUNDT said:

"Almost all chambers of commerce have committees to increase membership, to beautify the city, to establish closing hours, to improve the streets, et cetera; strangely enough, however, almost none of them have a single committee devoting its time and talents to the most important and immediate problem confronting all of them—the protection and preservation of our American formula of political independence and private enterprise.

"By holding essay contests in the schools; by setting aside 1 week each year for local community-wide programs depicting the basic values of our way of life; by making sure that at least one course in every high school is devoted to portraying What's right with America; by setting aside one Sunday each year to sermons in support of how a free society and a free church are inevitable and exclusive partners; and dozens of other ways throughout the year our local organizations can move constructively to protect a way of life which is fast disappearing from this earth. This is a program which costs nothing but initiative; it is one in which every community can engage."

REPORT ON HIGHWAY NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 249)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGRATH in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 8919.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 3083. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes.

THE NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGRATH in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all other enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Housing Act of 1949."

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require housing production and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage, the elimination of substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas, and the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, thus contributing to the development and redevelopment of communities and to the advancement of the growth, wealth, and security of the Nation. The Congress further declares that such production is necessary to enable the housing industry to make its full contribution toward an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. The policy to be followed in attaining the national housing objective hereby established shall be: (1) Private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can; (2) governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve more of the total need; (3) appropriate local public bodies shall be encouraged and assisted to undertake positive programs of encouraging and assisting the development of well-planned, integrated residential neighborhoods, the development and redevelopment of communities, and the production, at lower costs, of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life; (4) governmental assistance to eliminate substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas, to facilitate community development and redevelopment, and to provide adequate housing for urban and rural nonfarm families with incomes so low that they are not being decently housed in new or existing housing shall be extended to those localities which estimate their own needs and demonstrate that these needs are not being met through reliance solely upon private enterprise, and without such aid; and (5) governmental assistance for decent, safe, and sanitary farm dwellings and related facilities shall be extended where the farm owner demonstrates that he lacks sufficient resources to provide such housing on his own account and is unable to secure necessary credit for such housing from other sources on terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill. The Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies, and any other departments or agencies of the Federal Government having powers, functions, or duties with respect to housing, shall exercise their powers, functions, and duties under this or any other law, consistently with the national housing policy declared by this act and in such manner as will facilitate sustained progress in attaining the national housing objective hereby estab-

[PUBLIC LAW 155—81ST CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 292—1ST SESSION]

[H. R. 5240]

AN ACT

To continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by such title shall continue in effect until July 1, 1950, for the purpose of authorizing the exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government: *Provided, however,* That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased. /

Approved July 1, 1949.

